

3
The Divinity of our Blessed Saviour
prov'd from Scripture and Antiquity.

A ^{693.d}
SERMON³
Preach'd before the
UNIVERSITY
OF
OXFORD,

At S^t. MARY's,

On the EPIPHANY, Jan. 6th. 17 ^{$\frac{11}{12}$} .

*In which Mr. Whiston's Attempt to revive the Arian
Heresy is consider'd.*

By RICHARD IBBETSON M. A. Fellow
of Oriel College in Oxford.

OXFORD,

Printed at the THEATER, for Anthony Peisley: and are
to be sold by J. Knapton, H. Clements, and J. Morphew,
Booksellers in London. 1712.

Price Six Pence.

The Divinity of our Blessed Saviour
proved from Scripture and Antiquity.

A

SERMON

Preached before the

UNIVERSITY

OF

OXFORD

AT ST. MARY'S

On the Epiphany, Jan. 6. 1711

In which Mr. Whiston's Attempt to revive the Arian
Heresy is considered.

By RICHARD BARSTON M. A. Fellow
of Oriel College in Oxford.

OXFORD

Printed at the Theatre, for James Poyser, and are
to be sold by J. Knapton, H. Glasse, and J. Widdowes
Booksellers in London. 1712.

Printed and Sold

[3] T

A
SERMON

**Preach'd before the
University of OXFORD**

On the EPIPHANY &c.

I TIM. 3. 16.

*And without controversy, great is
the Mystery of Godliness, God was
manifest in the flesh.----*

THE Mysteries of Christianity have
been so boldly attack'd; and the
Divinity of our Saviour so confi-
dently deny'd; and that, by a Per-
son, who, upon account of his Education, Stu-
dies, and Profession, should have been more
firmly engag'd in the Interests both of Reli-
gion and Truth, that I hope it will not be

thought unseasonable, upon this day, and in this place, to undertake a defence of so important an Article of our Religion. And because the reviver of *these opinions* pretends to place his greatest strength in the most ancient Fathers, and primitive writers of our Religion, I shall endeavour chiefly from those very Authors to prove, that our Saviour is God in the most true and proper sense, and that from these following considerations.

I. From his being the Son of God.

II. From his being in the Scriptures call'd God and Lord.

III. From his being the Object of Adoration.

IV. From his having the Attributes of God, and particularly Eternity.

V. From his being Consubstantial, or of the Same Substance with God the Father.

In the proof of all these particulars I shall in a great measure confine my self to the Testimonies and Reasonings of the first Fathers within the compass this Author proposes, which is to the year of Christ One Hundred and

our Blessed Saviour, &c.

and Ninety, but without allowing or alledging the Authority of those books, which have been generally look't upon by the Church, by the Learned, and by all Parties in Religion, either as Spurious, or Heretical. I shall take notice too of some Texts of Scripture, especially those he has endeavour'd to pervert, and shew how irreconcilable his Notions are both to Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason. And

I. Jesus Christ is truly and properly God, because he is the Son of God. This is a consequence allow'd by the primitive writers: particularly *Irenæus* admits this proposition as true, *That whatsoever is born of God is God.* The Argument which was used by some was, That as he that is properly the Son of Man is Man, so he that is properly the Son of God is God. It is true indeed in some sense both Men and Angels may be, and are in Scripture call'd the Sons of God; but in a proper and peculiar sense only Christ is call'd so. *For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* In this point *Justin Martyr* is express, who in several places affirms, that *our Saviour only in a peculiar sense or manner is the Son of God.* And ³ that he alone is pro-

Heb. 1. 5.

1 Τὸ ἰδίον τοῦ θεοῦ γεννητὸν, θεὸς ἐστὶν p. 39. 2 Ἰδίος πατρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
γεννητὸν γεννητὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγουσι λέγουσι θεὸν. p. 67. Ἰωάννης Χρ-
στὸς μόνος ἰδίος ἡὸς τῷ θεῷ γεννητὸς p. 68. 3 Ὁ ὁ ἴδιος αὐτοῦ, ὁ μόνος
γεννητὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ λόγος ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ συνὸς καὶ ἰσὺς
καὶ ὁμοῦς. p. 44.

perly

perly call'd the Son of God. But it is needless to multiply instances in a case so universally agree'd upon, and therefore I proceed,

II. To prove that our Saviour is properly God, because he in the Scripture is call'd God, and Lord. This indeed is an argument this Author excepts against, and complains of the writers of Controversy, who upon this head heap up a number of Testimonies, instead of shewing that the word God, when ascrib'd to our Saviour, has the same signification, as when 'tis ascrib'd to the Father, or includes the same infinite and unbounded perfections. And upon this occasion he brings a number of Texts out of the Old and New Testament, where Angels and Men, and the Gods of the Heathen, i. e. Devils, are call'd Gods, as, *The Lord said unto Moses, see I have made thee a God unto Pharaoh. For I know that the Lord is great, and that our Lord is above all Gods: and several more to the same purpose, by which he endeavours to invalidate the force of this argument. But there is one place, which if he had produc'd entire, would have given a full answer to his objection: it is this, For tho' there be that are call'd Gods, whether in Heaven or on Earth (as there be Gods many, and Lords many.) But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him. In*

Prim. Faith.
P. 102.

Ex. p. 98. 99.

Exod. 7. 1.

Pl. 135. 5.

1 Cor. c. 8.
v. 5, 6.

which

whi
Chr
ma
tive
ther
per
ther
that
ther
it
the
stov
finc
his
the
at
shew
ble
His
Lor
wau
God
trul
afte
Son
good
pre
r
Apo
nom
igita
Spiri

which place it is plain, that our Saviour Jesus Christ is excepted out of the number of *those many*, who in a loose, general, or figurative sense are call'd Gods and Lords, and therefore is call'd God and Lord in that proper sense, in which it is here affirm'd, that there is *but one God and one Lord*. And that this was the sense of the Primitive Fathers, appears from *Irenaeus*, in whose days it seems there were some Hereticks made the same objection; and therefore he has bestow'd several pages in answering it; and since this Author has not thought it worth his notice, I shall hence transcribe some of the most material passages, because it will at the same time answer his objection, and shew the sense of one of the most considerable of the Primitive Fathers in this point. His words are these, *Therefore neither the Lord, nor the Holy Ghost, nor the Apostles would definitively and absolutely have call'd him God, who was not God, nor any one who was not truly God, and therefore (as he says a little after) since the Father is truly Lord, and the Son is truly Lord, the Holy Ghost did with very good reason give them the name of Lord*. And presently after he evidently distinguishes

¹ Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus, neque Apostoli eum, qui non esset Deus, definitive & absolute Deum nominassent aliquando, nisi esset vere Deus. p. 208. col. 1. ² Vere igitur cum Pater sit Dominus, & Filius vere sit Dominus, merito Spiritus Sanctus Domini appellatione signavit eos. *Ibid.*

them

them from those, who because they believe in the Name of Christ are made Sons of God, and therefore are sometimes call'd Gods in Scripture, but Gods not ¹ by nature, but adoption. And in the next page, ² when (says he) the Scripture speaks of those, which are not Gods, it does not absolutely, as I observ'd before, call them Gods, but with some addition and signification, by which they are shew'n not to be Gods. And applying this rule to Moses he has these words: ³ And Moses himself being the Man of God is made a God to Pharaoh, but he is not named truly Lord, nor God by the Prophets, but is by the Spirit call'd what he was, Moses the faithfull Servant of God. The whole matter he sums up thus: ⁴ Having answer'd this Cavil of theirs it is plainly shew'n, that neither the Prophets nor Apostles ever nam'd any other God, or call'd any one Lord, besides the true and only God. From which place it is very plain both what Irenaeus thought of this argument, and

Num. 12. 7.
Heb. 3. 5.

1 Quorum autem Deorum? quibus dicit, *Ego dixi, Dii estis, & filii Altissimi omnes.* His sc. qui adoptionis gratiam adepti sunt, per quam clamamus, *Abba pater.* p. 208. col. 2. 2 Cum autem eos, qui non sunt Dii, nominat, non in totum, quemadmodum praedixi, Scriptura ostendit illos Deos; sed cum aliquo additamento & significatione, per quam ostenduntur non esse Dii. p. 209. c. 1. 3 Et ipse autem Moyses homo Dei existens, Deus quidem datus est ante Pharaonem: non autem vere Dominus appellatur, nec Deus vocatur à prophetis, sed *fidelis Moyses famulus & servus Dei*, dicitur à Spiritu, quod & erat. p. 210. c. 2. 4 Soluta igitur & hac illorum calumnia, manifeste ostensum est, quoniam nunquam neque prophetae, neque Apostoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, praeter verum & solum Deum. p. 211. c. 1.

of

of our Saviour's Divinity; since he asserts, that the Scriptures call our Saviour Lord, and that they call no one so besides the true and only God: which I desire may be taken notice of, because this Author challenges us to shew where our Saviour either in Scripture or Antiquity is call'd the True God, or the Only God, or by any of the known Titles of the Supreme God, as God the Creator, the Invisible God, the Great God, the God over all &c. which question shall be here consider'd. That our Saviour is call'd the True God and the Only God, we have shewn from Irenaus, and therefore supposing there could be no instances brought, where the other Titles, he mentions are given him, it would only follow, that those Titles, which are generally given to the Father and not to the Son, were design'd to express the Distinction of Persons, not the Difference of Nature. However I shall shew that most of those Titles either in the Scriptures, or Fathers, or both, are often apply'd to God the Son, as well as other Epithets, Descriptions, and Appellations, which cannot agree to any Created Being.

He is call'd, Isai. 9. 6. *Wonderful, Counsellour, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.*

1 Cor. 2. 8. *The Lord of Glory.*

— 15. 47. *The Lord from Heaven.*

Tit. 2. 13. *The Great God.*

1 Joh. 5. 20. *The True God.*

Rev. 19. 16. *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.*

Comp. Ilii.
44. 6.

--- I. II. *Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last.*

Philip. 2. v. 5. 6. 7. *Let this mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus; who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* This Translation indeed He excepts against, and perhaps not without Reason; but let us see, whether the Alteration will do Him any Service. In order to which we must examine, what is meant by the *form of God*, and the *form of a servant*. That by the *form of a servant* is meant the *nature of man*, would be plain if the words were translated, as they should be, thus: *But made himself of no reputation, taking upon him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.* Where *being made in the likeness of men*, is an explanation of *taking the form of a servant*. And therefore in the Ancient Writers the Human Nature is often express'd by the name of *servant*, as the Divine Nature is by that of *Son* and *Lord*. Hence it has been with very good reason inferr'd, that as *taking the form of a servant*, i. e. *Human Nature*, signifies becoming truly and properly Man, so *being in the form of God*, must signify *being truly and properly God*. The original phrase indeed, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, is not besides to be met with in the New Testament, but it is us'd by Justin Martyr, where speaking of the Idols

See Bull.
Def. Fd.
Nic. p. 37.

Idols of the Heathens, he says ¹ *they have not the form of God, who, as he adds a little after, having an unspeakable glory and form, is injur'd, when the name of God is apply'd to corruptible things*: and in the opinion of *Athenagoras*, ³ *every thing is corruptible, that is not eternal, and consequently that is not God*. As to what is translated, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, this Author says, it should be translated thus, *did not assume to be equal [or like] to God*, which is the known sense of ἀρπαγμα ἡγήσασθαι in the profane language, he means, I suppose, in *Heathen Authors*. But I wish he had told us, in what Heathen Authors he meets with it in this sense; and since he has not done it, I shall here shew how it is us'd in Christian Authors, and from thence how it is here to be understood. *Eusebius* in his Ecclesiastical History, speaking of some, who, to avoid the Malice of their Enemies, took several Methods of destroying themselves, has this expression, τὸν θάνατον ἀρπαγμα θέμενοι, i. e. *looking upon death as a desirable thing*. And the same Author in his life of *Constantine* uses much the same phrase, οἷον ἀρπαγμα π τὴν ἐπα-

L. 8. c. 12.

L. 2. c. 31.

1 Επει αψυχα κη νεκρὰ ταῦτα γινώσκονται, εἰ θεὸς μορφὴν μὴ ἔχοντα. p. 57.
2 Οπερ εἰ μένοι ἄλογοι ἡγούμεθα, ἀλλὰ κη ἐφ' ὧν τῷ θεῷ γινώσκ, ὅς ἀρρη-
τοι δόξαν κη μορφῶν ἔχον, ἐπὶ φθαρτοῖς κη διορθοῖς θεραπεύειας πρὸς ἀγλαῖαν
ἐποιεῖται. Ib. 3 Η γὰρ ἀγέννητος α, καὶ ἐν αἰδίῳ ἡ γέννητος
φθαρτὴ ἐστ. p. 18. in quæ verba vide Cl. Bull. in Defens. fid. Nic.
p. 204. 205.

* See Dr.
Whitby up-
on the
place.

ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, looking upon this opportunity of returning as a very valuable blessing: and much in the same sense it is us'd by * *Heliodorus*. *Origen* explains the phrase thus, *he did not account of it as a great matter, that he was equal to God, and one with the Father: and in another place he says, that our Saviour shew'd a greater and more Divine Goodness, by humbling himself, and becoming subject to death, ἢ εἰ ἀπαγγέλλον ἡμῶν, &c. than if he had so highly valu'd, or so far insisted upon, his equality with God, as not to condescend to become a Servant, for the Salvation of the world. Agreeably to this use of the word, we may paraphrase the place thus: Let this mind be in you, that was in Jesus Christ, who being in the form of God, i. e. truly and properly God, was so far from appearing in the Pomp and Splendour of his Divinity, or making a shew of his equality with God, that he seem'd not to value this Privilege of his Nature, but condescended to take upon him the form of a Servant, i. e. the nature of man. And this is a sense most agreeable to the scope of the place, which is design'd to recommend Hu-*

I Nec rapinam ducit (*Christus*) esse se æqualem Deo, hoc est, non sibi magni aliquid deputat, quod ipse quidem æqualis Deo, & unum cum Patre est. *Lib. 5. in Ep. ad Rom.* 2 Τολμήσαντες γὰρ εἶπεν, πλείων ἢ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἑλθὼν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἀγαθῆς καὶ φαίνετο ὡς ἴσος, οὐκ ἑαυτὸν ἐκπεποιήκει γινώσκων ὁμήρους μέγας δυνατῆος, δυνατὴν δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ, ἢ εἰ ἀπαγγέλλον ἡμῶν τὸ εἶναι ἴσον Θεῷ, ἢ μὴ βυλαθεῖς ἐπὶ τῇ ἐξομῇ οὐρανόθεν γινώσκοντες αὐτοῦ. *Comm. in Johan. vol. 2. p. 34.*

military

mility and Condescension: since it would be but a very low Instance of it, for a Person, that is not God, not to assume to be equal with God; tho it certainly is a very great one, for a Person, that is God, to condescend to become Man. There is a place in *Irenæus*, which will serve very well both to illustrate this passage of Scripture, and confirm the truth of our Saviour's Divinity: these are the words, *Wherefore our Lord in the last days, summing up all things in himself, came unto us, not as he could have done, but as we were able to see him: for he could have come unto us in his incorruptible Glory, but we should not have been able to bear the Greatness of his Glory. This incorruptible Glory, by Irenæus ascrib'd to our Saviour, is what Justin Martyr calls an unspeakable glory and form, which cannot agree to corruptible things.*

I shall mention but one text more upon this head, which is *Rom. 9. 5.* the words are these: *--- of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.* This place puts Him to a great deal of trouble; for after a slight Attempt to evade the force of it, He labours very hard to prove that it ought to be Interpreted of God the Fa-

1 Διὰ τὸ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἐκ' ἐσχάτου τῆς καρπῶν, ἀνακεφαλαιωσά-
μενος αὐτὸν πᾶν πάντα, ἡλθὲν ὡς ἡμᾶς, σὺν ὡς αὐτὸς ἠδυνάτω, ἀλλ'
ὡς αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν ἠδυνάμεθα. Αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἀφ' ἧς αὐτὸν δόξῃ ὡς ὡς
ἡμᾶς ἐλθὼν ἠδυνάτω ἀλλ' ἡμᾶς ἠδυνάτωσι τὸ μέγιστον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ βα-
ταῖζον ἠδυνάμεθα. p. 376.

ther

Prim. Faith.
P. 14.

B.

L. 3. c. 18.

ther, contrary to the natural sense of the words and the consent of all Antiquity; and therefore why he should say, *that he does not expect any admirers of modern notions should embrace this exposition*, I don't understand, since it is it self a modern invention. The chief reason he gives for this interpretation, is, *that this phrase ὁ Θεὸς πάντων Θεός, the God over all, in the Scriptures and most primitive Antiquity directly and singly means God the Father, and that to call the Son so, was esteem'd little less than Ignorance, Heresy, and Blasphemy*; which he endeavours to prove out of the *Constitutions* and *Origen*. As to *Origen*, he is out of the Compals of time at first propos'd; the *Constitutions* are at best but of dubious authority; and therefore the Testimony of them both, tho' ever so exprefs, would in this case be but a weak argument; especially since *Irenæus*, an Author of undisputed credit in the second Century, understands this text of our Saviour. But because we have here a Specimen of this Author's Sincerity and fair dealing, I shall consider both the places. The words of the *Constitutions* in his own Translation run thus; *But others of them suppose that Jesus himself is the God over all, and glorify him as his own Father, and sup-*

Ἰ. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐκ αὐτῶν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐνὶ πάντων Θεὸν ὡς πτερόν, αὐτοὶ αὐτὰ πατέρα διδάσκοντες, αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ προσκυλῶν ὡς πτερόν, ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι ἐνέχοντες; Lib. 6. cap. 26.

pose

pose him to be both the Son and the Comforter, than which Doctrines what can be more detestable? and to the same purpose Origen speaks of some, ¹ who out of Rashness suppos'd our Saviour to be God over all. But sure this Author could not be ignorant, that these passages are nothing at all to his purpose; a man, that deals so much in Heresy, must know that in the Primitive Church there were some who confounded the Persons of the Trinity, and made the same Person both Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as may be seen in ² Justin Martyr and ³ Tertullian; and against these Hereticks the words of the Constitutions are evidently design'd. That Origen means the same men, and condemns only those, who suppos'd our Saviour to be God over all, so as to destroy the Distinction of Persons, will be evident beyond contradiction to any one, who considers his Comment upon this place; from which I shall transcribe the most remarkable passages. ⁴ I wonder (says he) at some per-

2 Εἰς δὲ τὰς, ὡς ἐν πλείοσι πιστεύοντων, καὶ διχορμήων ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ ἀρεπείῳ, ὑποπείθεσθαι τὴν σωτηρίαν εἶναι τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῶν. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ ἡμᾶς τοῖςτοι, οἱ περὶ ἡμῶν λέγουσι. Ο πατὴρ ὁ πρῶτος ἐστίν, καὶ μετὰ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς πατέρα φασκοῦντες εἶναι, ἐλέγχονται μήτε τὸν πατέρα ἐπιστάμενοι, μετ' ὅτι ἐστὶν ὡς τὸν πατέρα τὸν ὅλον καὶ ὑποκοινῶντες, ὡς καὶ λόγος πρῶτος τῶν ὡν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπαρχῶν. p. 96. 3 Adversus Praxeam. c. 2. 4 Et miror, quomodo quidam legentes, quod idem Apostolus in aliis dicit, Unus Deus Pater ex quo omnia, & unus dominus Jesus Christus per quem omnia, negent filium Dei Deum debere profiteri, ne duos Deos dicere videantur. Et quid de hoc loco Apostoli faciunt, in quo aperte Christus super omnia Deus esse perscribitur? sed non advertunt qui hæc ita sentiunt, quod sicut Dominum Jesum Christum non ita unum esse Dominum di-

sons,

1 Cor. c. 8.
v. 5. 6.

sous, who reading that the same Apostle in other places says, There is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, should from hence deny that we ought to own the Son of God to be God, lest they should seem to assert two Gods. But what will they do with this place of the Apostle, in which it is plainly written that Christ is God over all? it seems they had not at that time the evasions of this Author. But (as it follows) those of this opinion don't consider, that as he did not assert the Lord Jesus Christ so to be one Lord, as that from thence God the Father should not be call'd Lord; so neither did he say that God the Father was so one God, as that the Son should not be believ'd to be God. But they are both but one and the same God, because the Son has no other beginning of his Divinity than the Father, but is the most pure emanation of that one paternal fountain. Therefore Christ is God over all. — Now he that is over all must have none above him. For he is not after the Father, but of the Fa-

Pl. 120.

xit, ut ex hoc Deus Pater non Dominus dicatur: ita & Deum Patrem non dixit ita esse unum Deum, ut Deus filius non credatur. Vera enim est Scriptura quæ dicit: Scitois quoniam Dominus ipse est Deus. Unus autem uterque est Deus, quia non est aliud Filio divinitatis initium quam Pater, sed ipsius unius paterni fontis (sicut Sapientia dicit) purissima est emanatio Filius. Est ergo Christus Deus super omnia. — Qui autem super omnes est, super se neminem habet. Non enim post Patrem ipse, sed de Patre. — Si ergo Filius super omnes dicitur, & Spiritus Sanctus continere omnia memoratur, Deus autem Pater est ex quo omnia, evidenter ostenditur natura Trinitatis, & Substantia una, quæ est super omnia.

ther.

ther. If therefore (as he concludes) the Son is said to be over all, and the Holy Ghost to contain all things, and God the Father is he, of whom are all things, here is evidently shewn the nature of the Trinity, and one Substance, which is over all. This place, I hope, sufficiently proves, that Origen did not deny our Saviour to be God over all, in that sense, in which the Apostle and we assert it, but only in that, to which the Hereticks had perverted it.

It may be objected indeed that the Greek Text being lost, and we having only *Rufinus's* Translation of this place, whose Faithfulness we have reason to suspect, it does not appear whether these are *Origen's* own words, or only an Interpolation of his Translator. But in answer to this, let us suppose that *Rufinus* had taken the same liberty in these books, that ¹ he owns he has done in others, of enlarging upon what he thought wanted more particular explanation, yet this passage would be sufficient to prove what it was brought for, viz. to shew how *Origen* understood the Text it self, tho' the Deductions from it should be owing to his Translator. But as to these books upon the *Romans*, he has rather abridg'd. than enlarg'd them, as appears both ² from his own words, and from some Fragments that are left of the Original, and therefore

¹ Vide ejus Perorationem in Epist. ad Roman. ² Vide ejus Praefationem in Epist. ad Roman.

it is highly probable, that not only the sense given to this Text is *Origen's*, but even the reasoning upon it, in a great measure, his too: especially since it is agreeable to other parts of *Origen's* writings, which are come to our hands without Interpolations, and particularly to those very books against *Celsus*, in which our Saviour is affirm'd ¹ to be God ² from the beginning, and to be ³ *unmade*; and in other places he is call'd ⁴ the immutable and immortal God: and in short his Divinity is asserted in as high terms as can well be imagin'd.

After these places of Scripture, I shall shew what Titles are given our Saviour by the first Fathers.

He is call'd by ⁵ *Hermas* and *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, the Counsellor of God, too High a Title sure for a Creature.

By *Ignatius* He is call'd ⁶ the Invisible, the Impassible, who for our sakes became Visible and Passible: which Epithets too are given Him by ⁷ *Irenaeus*, who in the same place says he was Incomprehensible, but made Comprehensible. ⁸ *Ignatius* too in another place asserts his Omniscience.

1 Παντοκράτωρ ἀρχὴν εἶναι Θεὸν ἐν ᾧ οὗτος Θεός. *Contra Cels.* p. 135.
2 Αἰώνιον. *Ib.* p. 287. 3 Εἰ δὲ καὶ σῶμα θνητὸν καὶ ψυχὴ ἀσθραπτήν ἀταλάειν ὁ αἰώνιος Θεὸς λόγος, δοκεῖ καὶ Κέλευσιν ἀλλοτρίαν ἐ μεταπλάσσειν. μετατρέψαι οὐκ ὁ λόγος τῇ οὐσίᾳ μέγα λόγος, εἶναι μὲν πάρος ἐν πάρος τὸ σῶμα ἢ ἡ ψυχὴ. *Ib.* p. 170. vide & p. 169. 4 Vide infra. 5 Τὸν ἀόρατον, ὃ δὲ ἡμεῖς ὁρατὸν ἡ ἀπαθὴν, τὸν δὲ ἡμεῖς παθητὸν. *Epist. ad Polycarp.* c. 3. 6 Invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & Verbum homo. p. 241. col. 2. 7 Οὐδὲν ἀσθενεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὐκ κρυπτοὶ ἡμῶν ἐγγὺς αὐτῷ εἰναι. *ad Ephes.* c. 15.

In a book call'd the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs suppos'd by Mr. Dodwell to be writ in the first Century, and allow'd by this Author as good Authority, we have among others these remarkable Testimonies. In one place He is call'd, ¹ *The Lord, the Great God of Israel, who shall appear upon earth as man, and save Adam.* In another place the Sufferings of our Saviour are call'd, ² *The Passion of the Highest.* And his Appearance, ³ *The coming of the God of Righteousness.* And in another place, ⁴ *After this shall arise unto you the Lord himself, the Light of Righteousness.* Again, ⁵ *The Highest shall visit the Earth, himself coming as Man, eating and drinking among Men.* And afterwards, ⁶ *Then shall we rise every one upon his Scepter, worshiping the King of Heaven, who appear'd upon earth in the form of Humble Man.*

The next Testimony I shall mention, is from Melito Bishop of Sardis, of whom there are left only some Fragments, part of one of which I shall here transcribe from this Author's own Translation, that we may see whether this Father if he had been extant, would have help'd.

† Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μέγας ὁ Ἰσραὴλ φανεῖται ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ στήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἀδὰμ. v. Grabe Spicileg. vol. 1. p. 156. 2 Ἐπὶ τῇ πύξει τοῦ ὑψίστου. Ib. p. 160. 3 Παρουσία τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Ib. p. 187. 4 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστὰς ὑμῖν αὐτὸς Κύριος, φῶς δικαιοσύνης. Ib. p. 203. 5 Ὁ ὑψίστος ἐπισκεψέται τὴν γῆν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὲν τῷ ἄνθρωπον &c. p. 228. 6 Τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀναστήσομεθα, ἕκαστος ἐπὶ σκήπτρῳ ἡμῶν, προσκυνοῦντες τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ ἑρμῶν, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα ἐν μεσφῇ ἀνθρώπων ταπεινῶς. Ib. p. 251.

his cause; as he fondly imagins barely from the Title of one of his books, which is lost. These are his words, ¹ *The works of Christ after his Baptism, and especially his Miracles, declar'd and fully prov'd to the world his Divinity conceal'd in Flesh. For himself being at the same time God, and a perfect Man, he fully prov'd to us the Existence of his two Natures: his Divinity by those Miracles, which he wrought in the three years after his Baptism; and his Humanity in those thirty years, which were before his Baptism; wherein by his Infirmary as to the Flesh he conceal'd the Signs of his Divinity, altho' he was truly God before the world began.* I think his two Natures, his Divinity and his Humanity (both which this Author denies) could not be more fully, or clearly asserted; and *Irenæus* as expressly says, ³ *That He is truly Man, and that He is truly God.*

Besides these Testimonies, there is one consideration, which sufficiently shews the sense of the Fathers upon this Head, since they all agree that it was our Saviour that appear'd to the Patriarchs and *Moses*, and is

1 Τα γδ μὲν τὸ βάπτισμα ὑπὸ Χριστῷ προχθέντα, ἐ μάλιστα τὰ σημεῖα τῷ αὐτῷ κυρμυδῶν ἐν σαρκὶ θεότητι ἐδήλουν καὶ ἐπιγίντο τῷ κοσμῷ. Θεὸς γδ ὢν ὁμῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπος τέλει· ὁ αὐτὸς τὰς δύο αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπιστάτο ἡμῖν τὴν μὲν θεότητα αὐτῷ διὰ τὰ σημεῖα ἐν τῇ τριετίᾳ τῇ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα, τὴν δὲ ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς τετράκοντα χρόνοις τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ἐν οἷς διὰ τὸ ἀπίστευτον κατὰ σάρκα ἀπέκρυψε τὰ σημεῖα τῇ αὐτῇ θεότητι, καίπερ Θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἀεθαλὴς ὑπάρχων. *Melito ap. Cave Hist. Literar. V. 2. p. 33.* 2 It might be translated perfect God and Man; for τελειός in the Original, in all probability, refers to both. 3 Ab omnibus accipiens Testimonium, quoniam vere homo, & quoniam vere Deus, p. 302. col. 1.

in the old Testament call'd *Jehovah* and the *Lord of Hosts*, the known Titles of the Supreme God, and therefore they must believe that to him these Titles are truly applicable.

I have here only produc'd some of those passages, which the most fully prove our Saviour's Divinity, without taking notice of that multitude of places, where he is barely call'd *God*: because this is not allow'd as an Argument for his Divinity. But to a person, that considers it without prejudice, I cannot but think it must seem an unanswerable one, that the Fathers should so commonly call our Saviour God, and that absolutely, without any Limitation or Restriction, in places where they cannot be suppos'd to speak figuratively, but must be thought to speak the most accurately and properly they could, as when they argue against Infidels, and Hereticks, and when they deliver the Rule of Faith, and Summary of the Christian Doctrine, upon which occasions to call a Person *God*, that they believed not to be properly so, looks more like the *Artifice* of a *Jesuit*, than the *Simplicity* of a *Primitive Christian*.

III. Our Saviour is God, because he is the Object of Adoration.

That this a good Consequence, we have the Authority both of Reason and Revelation, both of the Law and the Gospel. For
what

Deut. 6. 13.
Math. 4. 10.

what does the Natural Notion of Worship imply less, than an Humble Application to a Being, that is both able to Hear us, and to Help us? and consequently must have the Divine Perfections of Omniscience and Omnipotence? and whatsoever Being has these Perfections, is God. Hence we have this Precept both in the Old and New Testament, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* And therefore *Justin Martyr* tells us, that in his days *they Worship'd God alone.* Now the same *Justin Martyr* says in several places, that *our Saviour is to be Worship'd.* The most remarkable of which I shall here produce at large, both because it fully proves the Divinity of the three Persons of the Trinity, and because this Author has set it in a false Light. It should be
 Translated thus: *But him (i.e. the Father) and his Son (who came from him, and taught us and the Host of Good Angels, who follow and resemble him, these things) and also the Prophetick Spirit we Worship and Adore, honouring them rationally and truly.* This he with the Papists translates thus, *We Worship and Adore him, as also his Son, who came and taught us these things; and the Host of other Good Angels,*

1 Οὗτοι Θεὸν μὲν ὡς πατὴρ προσκυνῶμεν. p. 64. 2 Ἀς δ' ἐν λίαν μὲν αὐτοῖς γραφάς, αἱ ἀφ' ἧν δὴ τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ πατρὸς ἐκ προσκυνῶμεν καὶ Θεὸν ἀποδεικνύουσιν. p. 294. vid. & p. 256. 3 Ἀλλ' ἐκείνους τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτῷ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς τὰῦτα ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκπορεύων ἐκ κοίτης μὲν ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων κρατὸν, πνεῦμα τε τὸ ἐκφύων σιὸν μὲν ἐκ προσκυνῶμεν, λόγος καὶ ἀληθεὶς τιμῶμεν. p. 56.

who follow and resemble him, and also the Prophetic Spirit. In which Translation this Passage is us'd as an Argument for the Worship of Angels. But it is very unaccountable, how a Person who professes so great an Esteem for *Justin Martyr*, should Translate him so as to make him frequently contradict himself in the compass of a few Pages, and that without the least Attempt to Reconcile the Inconsistency. For not far from this place *Justin* tells us, that, ¹ *after the Father, they with good reason honour'd the Son in the second place, and the Prophetic Spirit in the third place.* Whereas a little before according to Mr. *W's* Translation, the *Holy Angels* are said to be worship'd in the third place; and the *Prophe-tick Spirit* in the fourth. And not far after *Justin* both proves from Scripture that ² *God alone is to be worship'd*, and shews the Primi-tive Practice of ³ *worshiping him only.* If any one should think it strange, that Angels are said here to be taught these things as well as Men, it is intirely agreeable to the Primi-tive Notions, as may be seen in *Irenaeus* : P. 185. and in Scripture we are told, that this is *what the Angels desire to look into.* There is a ¹ *Pet. 1. 12.* passage in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, which

1 ἵνα αὐτῷ ᾖ ὅπως Θεῷ μαρτυρῆς, & εἰς διπλοῦς χώρας ἔχοντες, πνεύματι τὸ θεοφρονεῖν εἰς τρεῖς πλῆθος, ὅτι κατὰ λόγον τιμῶμεν, ἀποδεί-
ξιν. p. 60. 2 Ως δὲ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μόνον διὰ προσκυνήσας, ὡς ἵππων,
ἄλλων, μετὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν. Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν σε προσκυνήσας, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ
λατρεύσας ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, κύριον τὸν Θεὸν
τῶν ποιούντων. p. 63. 3 Vide supra.

will

not as to the Father: here seems to be a Distinction without a Difference. For I would willingly know, whether Proper Adoration, direct and distinct Invocation and Thanksgiving is not that sort of Worship, which we are forbid in the Old and New Testament to give to any but God; if it is, then the giving it to our Saviour proves him truly God; if it is not, then the giving it to a Creature is not Idolatry, since it does not offend against that Law, by which Idolatry is forbidden. But did not St. Paul, who had been brought up in the knowledge of the Jewish Law, understand either that, or Christianity? who at *Lystra* refus'd the Divine Honours that were design'd him, tho' they did not, I suppose, offer him the Supreme Worship neither, since they call'd *Barnabas* *Jupiter*, and him only *Mercury*, but instead of that, ran in among the People crying out, and saying, *Sirs, why do ye these things? we also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that you should turn from these vanities unto the Living God.* The same Argument (if this Author's opinion be true) must hold equally against the Worship of our Saviour, since according to his Notions, he is a man of like passions with us, being when he was Incarnate, as he affirms, liable to Temptations even in his Divine Nature, as the Rational Soul is tempted in other Men, by partaking of the Temptations of the Body. If he should say,

D

that

AG. 14.
14. 15.

Prim. Faith.
P. 297.

Prim. Faith.
p. 85.

fb.

Rev. 22.
v. 8. 9.

Prim. Faith.
p. 85.
p. 104.

that he owns our Saviour to be *truly God and Lord*, and therefore the Object of Adoration; it must be confess'd he does call Him so, but in his Elusive way he explains it. *..thus, That he is really by the Appointment of the Father, our God, and our Lord.* But if this be all the Divinity he allows Him, i. e. to be our God by Appointment, he can be our God only in such a sense, as *Moses* was a God to *Pharaoh*, or to the *Israelites*, that is commission'd by God to act in his Name: and consequently can have no greater right to our Worship, than *Moses* had to theirs: And if this be a good Consequence, *St. Paul* must have been too scrupulous in refusing the Worship of the *Lystrians*, and the Angel in the *Revelation* did not understand either our Religion or Himself, who, when *St. John* offer'd to worship him, said, *see thou do it not: for I am thy fellow Servant, and of thy Brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the Sayings of this Book: Worship God.*

But, that he may not complain of being misrepresented, I will here Examine, whether he allows our Saviour any other Divinity besides his being a God by Appointment. He asserts indeed, as we observ'd before, that *he is truly God and Lord*, and that *he is the Holy One of God, a Being or Person of Supereminent Perfections, Knowledge, Power and Authority, and so, far superiour to all subordinate Creatures.* But in another place asserts him

to

to be Created himself, and far inferiour to his Prim. Faith. p. 112. &c. 172. Father in Nature, Attributes, and Perfections and in his Divine Nature liable to Temptations and Sufferings. This is a Strange, Perplex'd, Inconsistent Account of our Saviour's Divinity (if we may call it so) and liable to more Objections than any Myſtery of Christianity, which yet this Author makes so bold with. *A Created God* is a downright Contradiction, and just as good sense as an *Uncreated Creature*: The Notion of a God necessarily implies *infinite Perfections, Eternal Existence* and *unbounded Power*; the Notion of a Creature a *limited Power* and *precarious Being*. And therefore if Jesus Christ was created, he cannot be truly God, and if he be truly God, he must not have been created. For I would gladly know, was Jesus Christ truly God and Capable of Adoration, because he was created with those supereminent Perfections of *Knowledge and Power superiour to all other Creatures*? if so, then the Angels must be Gods too, and may be worship'd, because they are created with the Perfections of Knowledge and Power Superiour to Ours: and not only so, but by this Argument every man of good Understanding or great Strength is a God to the Foolish and the Weak; and then we unjustly blame or censure the Flattery and Folly of those persons, who have given, or the Wickedness and Vanity of those men, who have receiv'd Divine Honours.

Ibid. p. 388. 390. 391.

As to the Assistance he pretends to from the Fathers upon this head, he has produc'd indeed a number of Testimonies to prove that *God alone is to be worship'd*, which we are so far from denying, that we from thence conclude, our Saviour is properly God: he labours to prove too, that God the Father is to be Worship'd, which is certainly True, but by no means to his Purpose; and therefore he produces some places in *Irenaeus*, where it is said, that *the Father only is to be Worship'd*: this is true too in *Irenaeus's* sense, but he cannot be ignorant, that *Irenaeus* does not speak this of the Father in opposition to the Son or the Holy Ghost, but to the false Gods, or *Aeons* of the *Valentinian* Hereticks. He has nothing besides of any Moment within his Compass of Time, except two Passages out of the *Constitutions*, which, notwithstanding the high Opinion he expresses of them, in the Judgement of an impartial Reader would (tho' they were certainly genuine) rather pass for an Argument against him, since they ascribe Proper and Direct Adoration and Worship to our Saviour, as much as to the Father. And for what reason he brings that famous Epistle of *Pliny* to the Emperour *Trajan* about the Christians, I cannot imagine, unless it was to prevent his

1 Quem enim Lex praconiaverat Deum, hunc ostendit Patrem; cui & servire soli oportet Discipulos Christi. p. 433.
 2 Vid. p. 114. col. 1. & *Feuardentinum in locum.*

Adversaries making use of it against him. The words are these: *They* (i. e. the Christians) *affirm'd that the Principal Part either of their Fault or their Error was this, that they were wont on a stated day, before it was light, to come together, and to sing alternately an Hymn to Christ as God.* Which sure is no Argument against his Divinity: especially since these very Hymns were appeal'd to by an Ancient Author about the end of the second Century to prove the Divinity of our Saviour against *Artemo*, who deny'd it, as may be seen in *Eusebius*: and we have one of these sort of Hymns now extant, which goes under the name of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, where Eternity is ascrib'd to our Saviour. This indeed is an Author he does not allow the Authority of, but the only reason, I am afraid, is because he does not favour his notions; since he may be reckon'd within that Period of Time he propos'd to consider: and besides, this Hymn is probably compos'd in the words of the Church, and therefore shews the Opinion not only of one Author, but of the whole Body of Christians.

Hist. Eccl. . .
L. 5. c. 28.

IV. The fourth thing I propos'd to shew was, that our Saviour is God, because he has the Attributes of God. That he is Omniscient and Omnipotent, we have shewn be-

Adfirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti statò die ante lucem convenire: carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem. L. 10. Ep. 98.

hæbent

fore,

fore, and if the time would permit, might easily be prov'd more fully; but I shall here chiefly insist upon his Eternity, because this is what this Author expressly denies, and says that he is never call'd in Ancient Writers *αἰδιος eternal*. I suppose he does not insist upon the word *αἰδιος*: if we can prove, that he had no Beginning of Existence, it is the same thing: tho' even the word *αἰδιος* is apply'd to our Saviour in *Ignatius's* Epistles, where he is call'd *λόγος αἰδιος*, the *eternal word*.

Ad Magnes.
c. 8.

That he is call'd in the *Revelation*, *Alpha and Omega*, the *First and the Last*, we have shewn before; now if he be the First he must have none before him, and consequently must be Eternal.

τ. 11.

Justin Martyr speaking of God's appearing to *Moses*, and calling himself *I am*, or *ὁ ὢν* (as it is in the Septuagint) says, *Plato borrow'd his notions of God from hence, & therefore call'd him τὸ ὢν, that which is*: upon which he makes this observation, *that both one and the other appears to agree to God, that always existed: for he is the only Eternal Being*. Now we know that all the Fathers, and particularly *Justin Martyr*, thought the person, that appear'd to *Moses*, to be the Son of God, and therefore it is plain he believ'd him eternal: and

Ἰ Τὸτο, ὃ ἀνδρὶς Ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῖς νοεῖν δυναμένοις ἐ δακτεῖ ἐν τῇ ταύτῃ
ἐναι, τῷ ἀεὶ ὄντι μόνῳ ἀβυσσότητι; ὁ μὲν γὰρ Μαυῖος, ὁ δὲ, ἔφη, ὁ ἱ Πλά-
των, τὸ ὢν, ἐκείνου ἢ τῷ εἰρημνῶν τῷ αἰεὶ ὄντι. Οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ ὄντι φαίνεται,
αὐτῆς γὰρ ἐπὶ μένος ὁ αἰεὶ ὢν, γένεσι δὲ μὴ ἔχων. p. 20.

indeed

indeed in another place he directly calls him
¹ ὁ ὢν ὁ αἰς, *he that always existed*, which is the
 same as αἰδιος.

² Athenagoras says, that he was not made:
 for God being an eternal Mind, had him in him-
 self from the beginning, i. e. from all eternity;
 which may serve as a Comment upon the
 first verse of St. John's Gospel, *In the begin-
 ning was the Word*: which is the same as *from
 the beginning*, and therefore from all eternity.

³ Theophilus Bishop of Antioch says, that
 he was always implanted in the Heart of God,
 as being his Counsellour before any thing was made:
 which is much the same, that Hermas says of
 him, ⁴ *That he is ancients than any Creature,*
insomuch that he was in Council with his Father
at the Creation of all things.

Irenæus frequently and fully asserts his
 Eternity, he calls him in one place *the Eter-
 nal Word of God*, and blames those who *assign
 him a Beginning*. Probably the Original word
 was αἰδιος. In another place he expresses

1 Οὐτὸς ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ παντὸς πατεὶς — ἔστι ὁ αἰς, σημεῖον υἱὸς
 λογισθεὶς, p. 531. 2 Vide infra. 3 Τὸν λόγον, τὸν ὄντα δια-
 παντὸς ἐνδύμετον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ. ὡς γὰρ τι γίνασκ' αὐτὸν εἶχε σύμβου-
 λον ἑαυτῷ ὡν, καὶ φρονήσων ὄντα. p. 100. 4 Filius quidem Dei omni
 Creatura antiquior est, ita ut in Consilio Patri suo adfuerit ad
 condendam Creaturam. L. 3. Sim. 9. c. 12. 5 ——— decentiora
 autem magis quam hi, qui latronem prolative hominum verbi
 transferant in Dei æternum Verbum, & prolationis initium do-
 nantes & genesin, quemadmodum & suo verbo. Et in quo di-
 stabit Dei Verbum, immo magis ipse Deus, cum sit Verbum, à
 verbo hominum, si eandem habuerit ordinationem & emissionem
 generationis? p. 138. col. 2. ubi vide annot. Cl. Grabe.

himself

himself thus: *'Thou art not unmade, O Man, nor didst thou always coexist with God as his own Word.* And in another place he speaks thus, *'We have stout out all the Contradiction of those who say, if therefore Christ was born, he did not exist before. For we have shewn, that the Son of God did not then begin to be, since he existed always with the Father.* These Testimonies are so express, that it is pleasant to see what Difficulties he is put to in order to elude them. He tells us, *Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others, after Philosophy came in, ventur'd to affirm, that the Son was in a secret manner in the Father, before his Generation or Creation: this he calls in another place a Philosophick Eternity, and a Metaphysick Existence, or an Existence in duobus, i. e. a potential not an actual Existence, and says that Irenaeus seems to have been the fondest of this Philosophick Eternity of the Son of God, and to have carry'd it the nearest to a real Eternity, of all the Ancients. Which is a strange way of Talking: for the nearer he carries it to a real Eternity, the less fond he must be of this Philosophick Eternity, which is not a real one. But indeed Irenaeus not only carries it near to, but plainly asserts the real Eternity of the Son of God, as the passages*

Hist. Pref.
P. 63.

Prim. Faith.
P. 157.

P. 128.

P. 157.

1 Non enim infectus es, o homo, neque semper coexistebas Deo sicut proprium ejus verbum. p. 169. col. 2. 2 Exclusa est omnis contradictio dicentium: Si ergo natus est, non erat ante Christus. Ostendimus enim, quia non tunc coepit Filius Dei, existens semper apud Patrem. p. 245. col. 1.

produc'd

produc'd above fully evince. But why he P. 148.
 should here bring a long Quotation out of *Tertullian*, whose Authority he disallows, to shew
 the Sense of the more ancient Writers; or
 why *Irenæus* should be joyn'd with *Tertullian*,
 I do not understand. For besides that *Tertullian*
 was something later, he was a man of
 wit and fancy, and tho' as to the main of
 his Doctrine in this point, *it came from the*
Rule of Faith deliver'd by the Apostles, as he
 says in this very Book against *Praxeas*, yet he C. 2.
 ventur'd at Explications and Similitudes of
 his own, which instead of explaining do but
 the more obscure these inexplicable Myste-
 ries. Whereas *Irenæus* was a wiser man, and
 kept close to what was reveal'd, and *blam'd*
those, who pretended to know the ineffable Myste-
ries of God, or were too curious in enquiring after
what manner the Son was deriv'd from the Fa-
ther, which he says no one knows, for who has Itai. 53.8.
declar'd his Generation? and therefore it is
 very unjust to reflect upon him as mixing
 Philosophical Notions with the Doctrines

I Et Propheta quidem ait de eo : *Generationem ejus quis enarra-*
bit? Vos autem generationem ejus ex Patre divinantes, & verbi
 hominum per linguam factam prolationem transferentes in Ver-
 bum Dei, juste detegimini à vobis ipsis, quod neque humana,
 nec divina noveritis. Irrationabiliter autem inflati, audaciter
 inenarrabilia Dei Mysteria scire vos dicitis. — Si quis itaque
 nobis dixerit: Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus à Patre est? dici-
 mus ei, quia prolationem istam, sive generationem, sive nuncu-
 pationem, sive adaptionem, aut quolibet quis nomine voca-
 verit, generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit.
P. 176.

E

of

of Christianity; for indeed he was not one of those, who of Heathen Philosophers became Christians, and after their younger years spent in Philosophical Speculations, apply'd themselves late to the study of the Christian Religion; but was educated in it from his youth, and was some time a Disciple of *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*: and therefore upon account of these Advantages his Authority is of more weight than any Author we have of the same age, nay even than *Justin Martyr*, who was something ancienter, but had been converted from Heathenism, and was not originally a Christian.

Prim. Faith.
P. 128.

Def. fid.
Nic. p. 209.
&c.

That any of the first Fathers asserted our Saviour's Existence from Eternity to have been only *ἐν δυνάμει* or *in potentia*, as he insinuates, is utterly false. Indeed *Tatian* the Heretick does say, that the Word subsisted in the Father *διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως*, i.e. *by a rational power*, but Bishop *Bull* has said enough to convince any man, that he did not mean by this, a *potential* but an *actual* Existence, and his incomparable Exposition of this place should have been confuted, before it was us'd as an Argument against the Eternity of our Saviour. However since there is some Difficulty in this Passage, and we have Evidence enough besides, I have omitted this Testimony, as well for want of Perspicuity in the place, as Authority in the Writer.

Indeed *Athenagoras* and *Theophilus* of *Antioch*

tioch do speak of a Generation of the Son some time before the Creation of the World, and in order to it: but it is plain they do not mean a proper Production, or a bringing him into Being, who did not exist before; since they make his Existence antecedent to this Generation. But they understand *his coming out of the Father* to create all things, or this first Manifestation of himself in the Formation of the World, and this they call Generation. This Author may be as angry as he pleases with this Interpretation, but it is impossible to understand them in any other Sense, and Words must be taken as the Authors design'd them, *Athenagoras*, after he had said, that *The Son was the first Production of the Father*, not (says he) that he was made, (for God being an Eternal Mind, had his Word in himself from the Beginning, since he was Eternally rational) but because, when all material things (the Earth and Nature being without form) had their Particles confus'dly jumbled together, he came out to give them Form and Essence. And to this account agrees the Prophetick Spirit, saying, *The Lord created me the Beginning of his Ways for his Works*; here we see *Athenagoras* manifestly explains this Generation, or Pro-

Prim. Faith.
P. 132.

P. 10.

Ἰ Πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τὸ πατρὶ, ἔχ' ὡς γαμῶνον (ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεός, ὡς αἰδώς ὦν, εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ λόγον, αὐτὸς αἰδώς λογικὸς ὦν) ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ ὕλον καὶ ζυμῶντων, ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως καὶ γῆς, ὁχείας ὑπακλῶν διὰ τὴν μαμυγμῶν τὸ παχυμερῆσαν πρὸς τὰ καφάρια ἐκ' αὐτοῖς, ἰδέα καὶ ἐνέργεια εἶναι πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν. συνεῖδεν γὰρ τὸ λόγον καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν πρῶτον Κύριος γὰρ (φησὶν) ἐκ τῆς με, ἀρχὴν ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἰς ἔξω αὐτῆς, p. 10.

E 2

duction

Prov. 8. 22.

duction of the Son to be his *Coming out of the Father*, in order to act in the Creation of the World. And this very place will furnish us with a full Answer to that repeated Objection of his, taken from some of the Fathers who apply this Passage in the *Proverbs*, according to the Septuagint Translation, to our Saviour, *The Lord created me the Beginning of his Ways, for his Works*. Since it is plain, that *Athenagoras* understood no more by it, than the Son's being sent or *coming forth* to create the World: and I cannot find that any of the first Fathers, who quote this Text, meant to assert any more by it than the Generation of the Son: and I suppose he does not pretend to argue from the place it self, since the Translation from the original Hebrew is thus, *The Lord possess'd me in the Beginning of his way, before his Works of old. I was set up from Everlasting, from the Beginning, or ever the Earth was. When there were no Depths I was brought forth, &c.* which is by Commentators made parallel to *Joh. 1. 1. In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God*, and us'd as an Argument for the Divinity and the Eternity of our Saviour.

V. Our Saviour is God, because he is Consubstantial, or of the same Substance with God the Father.

The only Authority which he has produc'd with any shew of an Argument against the
Con-

Consubstantiality of the Son, is that of *Justin Martyr*, who asserts that the Son ¹ is numerically distinct from the Father: but in the same place he says, ² that he was from the Father, not by *Abscission*, as if the Substance of the Father was divided; and therefore it is plain he believ'd he was Consubstantial, or of the same undivided Substance with God the Father; and consequently meant no more by this numerical Distinction, than we do by a personal Distinction. If he should say that this Expression is not proper; we own it is not what is generally understood now by a numerical Distinction, but it is evidently what *Justin Martyr* meant: and this Author has the least right of any person to insist upon Propriety of Expression, who scruples not to call what he thinks properly a *Creature*, truly God, than which there cannot be a greater, either Impropropriety, or Absurdity.

Athenagoras asserts that ³ the Father and the Son are one, the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son by the Unity and Power of the Spirit: and a little after, having said, ⁴ that the Prophetick Spirit is an Emanation from God as Light is from the Sun, he concludes

1 Αλλὰ καὶ ἀεὶ μὴ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκείνου. p. 358. 2 Γενητὸς δὲ πατρὸς, δυνάμει ἐβλήθη αὐτῷ; ἀλλὰ ἡ κατὰ δόξα μὲν, ὡς ἀπομαρτυροῦντος ὁ πατρὸς ἑστίαις. Ib. 3 Εὐδὲς ὅτι ὁ πατρὸς καὶ ὁ υἱός ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἐν πατρὶ, ἐ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ, ἐστὶν καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος. p. 10. 4 Καὶ τοὶ ἐ αὐτῷ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν τοῖς ἐμφανέσι πνευματικῶς ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς ὁ Θεὸς, ἀπορρέον καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὡς ἀκτὶν ἀπὸ ἡλίου. τίς ἐν σοὶ ἀν ἀπορήσει, λέγοντας Θεὸν πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν Θεόν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύοντας thus:

thus: *Who therefore would not wonder to hear us call'd Atheists, who assert God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and declare their Power in Unity, and Difference in Order?* Here we plainly see, that all the Difference or Distinction *Athenagoras* makes between the Persons of the Trinity, is only of Order, not of Nature; and in another place he says, that the Son ¹ is undivided from the Father, and therefore he must be Consubstantial.

Irenaeus tells us, ² that God the Father and his Word is one and the same God. ³ That it is peculiar to the Supereminence of God, not to want any other Instruments for the making of all things that were made; for his own Word was sufficient for the formation of all things. And therefore he says in another place, ⁴ That there is only one God the Creator, who made all things by himself, that is, by his Word and his Wisdom: which are the Names by which *Irenaeus* expresses the Son and the Holy Ghost, as will be further evident from another place, where he says thus: ⁵ Therefore the Angels did not make us, nor form us, nor indeed could the An-

αὐτῶν ἢ τὸ ἐν τῇ ἰσότητι δυνάμει, ἢ τὸ ἐν τῇ ταύτης διαίρεσι, ἀλλ' οὐκ
 ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος; Ib. 1. Εἰ καὶ Θεὸς ὁ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγος ἦν καὶ
 μὴν ἀμερίσθαι πάντα ὑποτάκται. p. 17. 2. Cum sit unus & idem
 Deus Pater & Verbum ejus. p. 349. col. 1. 3. Proprium est enim
 hoc Dei supereminentiae non indigere aliis organo, ad conditionem
 eorum quae fiunt, & idoneus est & sufficiens ad formationem
 omnium proprium ejus Verbum. p. 117. col. 1. 4. Sed solus
 unus Deus Fabricator — qui fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc est
 per Verbum & per Sapientiam suam. p. 185. col. 1. 5. Non ergo
 Angeli fecerunt nos, nec nos plasmaverunt, nec Angeli potue-

gels,

gels, or any one besides the Word of God, or any Power, far distant from the Father of all things, make the Image of God. Nor did the Father want these to make, what he had before appointed to be made; as if he had not his own Hands. For the Word and Wisdom, the Son and Spirit, are always present with him, by whom he freely made all things, to whom he speaks saying, *Let us make man after our Image and Likeness*: by which places it is plain that *Irenæus* believ'd the Son to be Consubstantial with the Father, tho' he does not make use of the word: for if the Son be God himself, and one and the same God with God the Father, as *Irenæus* asserts, he must be one and the same Substance. And why this Author should insist so much upon the word, since we plainly have the sense of it, I don't see: even *Socinus* himself thought this was trifling, and says *that they expos'd their Cause who went*

Gen. 1.25.

runt imaginem facere Dei, nec alius quis præter Verbum Domini, nec virtus longe abstitens à Patre universorum. Nec enim indigebat horum Deus ad faciendum, quæ ipse apud se præstiterat fieri, quasi ipse suus non haberet manus. Adest enim ei semper Verbum & Sapientia, Filius & Spiritus, per quos & in quibus omnia libere & sponte fecit, ad quos & loquitur dicens, *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem & similitudinem nostram*. p. 320. col. 1. Nemini viro cordato unquam persuadebitis, id, quod per ea vocabula adversarii significare voluerunt, idcirco repudiandum esse, quia ipsa vocabula scripta non inveniuntur. Immo quicumque ex vobis hac ratione sunt usi, suspectam apud nonnullos, aliqui ingenio & eruditione præstantes viros, causam nostram reddidere. Satis est enim apud omnes veritatis amantes, rem ipsam, de qua quæstio est, rationibus vel Testimoniis confirmari: quamvis vocabula, quæ in ipsa quæstione explicanda expressa sunt, diserte scripta non inveniuntur. Vol. 2. p. 778.

upon

upon such grounds. For it is sufficient for men that are concern'd for Truth, that the thing it self in dispute is prov'd by Reasons or Testimonies, though the words are not to be met with.

Hist. Pref.
P. 27.

I have now gone through what I at first propos'd, and hope I have shewn, that there is that Evidence for the Divinity of our Saviour both in Scripture and Antiquity, that it cannot easily be conceiv'd, how a person can deny the Truth of the one, without disbelieving the Authority of the other. This Reflection I hope will not seem too severe, since (to use this Author's words a little alter'd, with which I shall conclude) *It is in behalf of the Original Christian Faith, against the Corruptions of Philosophy and Suggestions of Infidelity, Vain Philosophy, and Daring Infidelity. What is Popery and Priestcraft if this be not so? to suppress or corrupt the Ancient Books: to vouch Spurious or Suspected Authorities: to advance Groundless Niceties against certain Articles of the Christian Faith: to overlook or evade express Testimonies: to put forc'd and absurd Interpretations on the plain words of Scripture: and all this in order to revive an Exploded Heresy, and support a Baffled Cause.*

Now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, be all Honour, Praise, and Thanksgiving, now and for evermore. Amen.

F I N I S.